	Case 2:23-cv-03000-DC-SCR Document	t 14 Filed 01/22/25	Page 1 of 2
1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7			
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
10			
11	EARON DREVON DAVIS,	No. 2:23-cv-3000-D	C-SCR (PS)
12	Plaintiff,		
13	v.	ORDER ADOPTING	
14	ACEF-MARTIN FOLSOM LLC,	RECOMMENDATIONS AND DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR DEFAULT	
15	Defendant.	JUDGMENT  (Day No. 7, 12, 13)	
16		(Doc. No. 7, 12, 13)	
17			
18	Plaintiff Earon Drevon Davis is proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis in this civil		
19	action initiated on December 26, 2023. (Doc. No. 1.) This matter was referred to a United States		
20	Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302.		
21	On December 11, 2024, the assigned magistrate judge issued findings and		
22	recommendations recommending that Plaintiff's motion for default judgment (Doc. No. 7) be		
23	denied because (1) the clerk never entered default, which is a prerequisite for default judgment		
24	under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 55; (2) the action can be resolved on the merits and		
25	Defendant ACEF-Martin Folsom LLC ("ACEF-Martin") is defending itself in the action; and (3)		
26	Plaintiff cannot be granted default judgment when there is no operative complaint on file. (Doc.		
27	No. 12 at 7.) Those findings and recommendations were served on Plaintiff and contained notice		
28	that any objections thereto were to be filed within fourteen (14) days from the date of service. (Id.		
		1	

## 1 at 8.) Plaintiff filed objections to the pending findings and recommendations on December 20, 2 2024. (Doc. No. 13.) 3 In his objections, Plaintiff does not meaningfully address the magistrate judge's findings 4 and recommendations. Instead, Plaintiff argues, to no avail, that the magistrate judge improperly 5 denied Plaintiff's motion for default judgment because Defendant ACEF-Martin failed to timely 6 respond to Plaintiff's motion. (Id. at 3.) Thus, Plaintiff's objections simply do not provide a basis 7 upon which to reject the pending findings and recommendations. 8 In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C), this court has conducted a 9 de novo review of the case. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, the court finds the findings 10 and recommendations to be supported by the record and by proper analysis. 11 Accordingly, 12 1. The findings and recommendations issued on December 11, 2024 (Doc. No. 12) 13 are adopted in full; and 14 2. Plaintiff's motion for default judgment (Doc. No. 7) is denied. 15 16 IT IS SO ORDERED. 17 Dated: **January 21, 2025** 18 Dena Coggins 19 United States District Judge 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28

Document 14

Filed 01/22/25

Page 2 of 2

Case 2:23-cv-03000-DC-SCR